

Sombrero adiabatic quantum computation

Alejandro Perdomo,¹ Salvador E. Venegas-Andraca,^{2,1} and Alán Aspuru-Guzik¹

¹*Department of Chemistry and Chemical Biology,
Harvard University, 12 Oxford Street, 02138, Cambridge, MA*

²*Quantum Information Processing Group. Tecnológico de Monterrey Campus Estado de México. Carretera Lago Gpe. Km 3.5, Atizapán de Zaragoza, Edo. México, México*

Adiabatic quantum computation (AQC) employs the ground state of time-dependent Hamiltonians for algorithm implementation. AQC initial Hamiltonians conventionally have a uniform superposition as ground state. We diverge from this practice by introducing a new strategy, in which adiabatic evolution starts with an initial guess chosen at random or following intuition about the problem, followed by a “sombrero-like” perturbation, hence the name sombrero AQC (SAQC). We provide a scheme to build initial Hamiltonians which encode such initial guesses in their ground states, and we present a proof of concept for SAQC by performing an exhaustive numerical study on hard-to-satisfy instances of the satisfiability problem (3-SAT). Our results show that about 35% of the initial 7 variable guesses have a significantly larger minimum gap compared to the minimum gap expected for conventional AQC (CAQC), possibly allowing for more efficient quantum algorithms. Finally, we propose serial and parallel versions of a quantum adiabatic algorithm based on SAQC.

PACS numbers: 03.67.Lx, 03.67.Ac, 03.65.-w

Adiabatic quantum computation (AQC) [1] is a promising paradigm of quantum computation because of its robustness [2, 3], its encouraging results in the study of NP-complete problems [1, 4, 5, 6, 7], and its implementation for the study of statistical mechanical complex problems such as protein folding [8]. We explore the effects on computational efficiency of starting the adiabatic evolution with a random or an educated guess to the problem instead of giving equal weight to all possible solutions as is usually done in AQC. Physical intuition as well as constraints within the problem can be used to make an educated guess. For example, in a lattice model for protein folding [8], a possible educated guess would be to start with an amino acid configuration in which no two amino acids spatially overlap and the amino acids are connected in the primary sequence that defines the protein. One might also use classical methods or a mean field approach to find approximate solutions to be used as educated guesses. For example, a Hartree-Fock solution may be used as the initial state for an adiabatic preparation of an exact molecular wave function [9].

AQC algorithms transform an initial state $|\psi(0)\rangle$ into a final state $|\psi(T)\rangle$ (which encodes the answer to the problem) by evolving the corresponding physical system according to the Schrödinger equation with a time-dependent Hamiltonian $\hat{H}(t)$. The algorithm relies on the quantum adiabatic theorem [10], which states that the time propagation of the quantum state will remain very close to the instantaneous ground state $|\psi_g(t)\rangle$ for all $t \in [0, T]$, whenever $\hat{H}(t)$ varies slowly throughout the propagation time $t \in [0, T]$. Conventionally, the adiabatic evolution path is the linear sweep of $s \in [0, 1]$:

$$H(s) = (1 - s)H_{transverse} + sH_f. \quad (1)$$

$\hat{H}_{transverse}$ is usually chosen such that its ground state is a uniform superposition of all possible 2^n computational basis vectors. Here we take the spin states $\{|q_i = 0\rangle, |q_i = 1\rangle\}$, which are the eigenvectors of $\hat{\sigma}_i^z$ with eigenvalues +1 and -1, respectively, as the basis vectors. Then the ground state is $|\psi_g(0)\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^n}} \sum_{q_i \in \{0,1\}} |q_n\rangle |q_{n-1}\rangle \cdots |q_2\rangle |q_1\rangle$. Such an initial ground state is easy to prepare and gives equal probability to all possible solutions.

For SAQC, the time-dependent Hamiltonian can be written as:

$$\hat{H}_{sombrero} = (1 - s)\hat{H}_i + \text{hat}(s)\hat{H}_{driving} + s\hat{H}_f. \quad (2)$$

The non-degenerate ground state of the initial Hamiltonian \hat{H}_i encodes a guess to the solution, and the $\hat{H}_{driving}$ term couples the states in the computational basis. The function $\text{hat}(s)$ satisfies $\text{hat}(0) = \text{hat}(1) = 0$, because $\hat{H}_{driving}$ acts only in the range $s \in (0, 1)$ in a “sombrero-like” time dependence (Fig. 1).




FIG. 1: (Color online) Profile for the time dependence intensity of the transverse field in CAQC (left) and SAQC (right). Two possible choices are presented for the latter.

As preparing an arbitrary initial non-degenerate ground state for adiabatic evolution is not a trivial task, we focus on initial guesses that consist of one of the states

in the computational basis. We also provide a strategy to build initial Hamiltonians such that the initial guess corresponds to non-degenerate ground states.

For a guess corresponding to a state $|q_N \cdots q_1\rangle$, the initial Hamiltonian can be written as

$$\hat{H}_i = \sum_{n=1}^N (\hat{q}_n + \delta_{1,q_n} (I - 2\hat{q}_n)), \quad (3)$$

where δ_{1,q_n} is the Kronecker delta, $q_n \in \{0,1\}$, and \hat{q}_n stands for the quantum operator $\hat{q} \equiv \frac{1}{2}(I - \hat{\sigma}^z)$, acting on the n -th qubit of the multipartite Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_N \otimes \mathcal{H}_{N-1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{H}_n \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{H}_1$. The operator \hat{q}_n is given by $I_N \otimes I_{N-1} \otimes \cdots \otimes (\hat{q})_n \otimes \cdots \otimes I_1$, where \hat{q} has been placed in the n th position and identity operators act on the rest of the Hilbert space.

Encoding an educated or a random guess into \hat{H}_i (Eq. 3) makes both \hat{H}_i and \hat{H}_f (Eq. 2) diagonal in the computational basis. Thus, connecting \hat{H}_i and \hat{H}_f with a linear ramp (as in Eq. 1), i.e. omitting operator $\hat{H}_{driving}$, would yield zero probability for evolution from the state of the computational basis representing the guess to the state encoding the unknown solution to the problem. To avoid such a situation, $\hat{H}_{driving}$ must introduce non-diagonal terms in $\hat{H}_{sombbrero}$ that allows the initial state to go from any arbitrary guess to the solution.

In order to provide a proof of concept for SAQC and to test the potential usefulness of both random and educated guesses in adiabatic evolution, we performed a numerical study on hard-to-satisfy 6- and 7-variable instances of the 3-SAT problem and compared our results with the CAQC approach. Our randomly generated 3-SAT instances have a unique satisfying assignment (USA) and their number of clauses to number of variables ratio is $\alpha \approx 4.26$. This value of α corresponds to the phase transition region where hard-to-satisfy instances are expected to be found [11, 12].

In order to exhaustively study the impact of different initial guesses with respect to unique solutions in the behavior of SAQC, we computed 64 different initial Hamiltonians (using Eq. 3) for each 6-variable USA instance, with each Hamiltonian corresponding to an initial string of 6 bits. Similarly, we computed 128 Hamiltonians for each 7-variable instance, one per possible initial guess (see Fig. 2). The final Hamiltonians in our study were built using the rationale introduced in [1, 4]. Each \hat{H}_f has a non-degenerate ground state encoding the unique solution of one of our 3-SAT instances with corresponding ground eigenvalue equal to zero, i.e. there is only one bit string leaving the corresponding 3-SAT instance with zero unsatisfied clauses (UC=0). The final Hamiltonians are the same for both CAQC and SAQC.

In order to make a fair comparison between CAQC and

SAQC, we set

$$\hat{H}_{driving} = \hat{H}_{transverse} = \delta \sum_{n=1}^N \hat{q}_n^x, \quad (4)$$

in Eq. 2, where \hat{q}_n^x stands for the quantum operator \hat{q}^x acting on the n th qubit of the multipartite Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_N \otimes \mathcal{H}_{N-1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{H}_n \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{H}_1$. The operator \hat{q}_n^x is given by $I_N \otimes I_{N-1} \otimes \cdots \otimes (\hat{q}^x)_n \otimes \cdots \otimes I_1$, where the operator $\hat{q}^x \equiv \frac{1}{2}(I - \hat{\sigma}^x)$ has been placed in the n th position, and the I_i 's are identity operators. From a physical point of view, the Hamiltonians $\hat{H}_{driving}$ and $\hat{H}_{transverse}$ can be related to a transverse magnetic field. The intensity of these Hamiltonians is tuned by varying the δ parameter. Since δ is equally varied for both adiabatic algorithms, all the dependence of the transverse field intensity lies on functions $(1-s)$ in Eq. 1 and $\text{hat}(s)$ in Eq. 2. A reasonable requirement for a fair comparison between CAQC and SAQC is that they both provide the same average intensity of the transverse magnetic field in $s \in [0,1]$. A choice of $\text{hat}(s)$ with the same average $\int_0^1 \text{hat}(s) ds = \int_0^1 (1-s) ds = 1/2$, is $\text{hat}(s) = 3s(1-s)$.




FIG. 2: Scheme for 6 binary variables SAQC calculations. We generated 2^6 3-SAT USA instances (first branching). For each instance, we computed minimum-gap values associated with all possible settings of SAQC (Eq. 2) of all possible guesses (second branching), using 20 different values of $\delta \in \{0.5, 1.0, \dots, 10.0\}$ (third branching). The same scheme was applied to 7 binary variable 3-SAT USA instances (not shown) for a total of $(128\text{USA}) \times (128\text{guesses}) \times (20\text{values of } \delta) = 327,680$ SAQC settings.

Fig. 3 shows our numerical results on the dependence of the minimum-gap value, g_{min} , as a function of δ . Curves were computed by taking the median of all bit strings that fulfilled the criteria specified in the legend boxes, namely either to produce i unsatisfied clauses (UC= i) when substituting a bit string in its corresponding instance, or to be j bit flips away from the solution (BF= j). We focused on UC and BF because, in principle, the notion of closeness of an initial guess to the actual solution may be defined with either parameter. Data corresponding to a fixed value of δ is a statistical representation (median) of typical g_{min} values that would be expected for hard 3-SAT instances if the guess state belonged to




FIG. 3: (Color online) Summary of the 327,680 calculations for 7 variable 3-SAT instances of minimum-gap median values as a function of the transverse field intensity within groups sorted by number of bit flips (BF) (a) and number of unsatisfied clauses (UC) (b). Plots include the 128 calculations using CAQC (Eq. 1). Values in parentheses correspond to numbers of data points which contributed to each curve. Results for 6 variable instances (not shown) are similar to those for 7 variable instances.

a definite number of UCs or BFs under an experimental setup using SAQC. Such curves are compared with the minimum gap expected for CAQC.

The dependence of g_{min} values as a function of the transverse field intensity δ leaves open some important questions regarding the efficiency of adiabatic quantum algorithms, whether CAQC or SAQC. For example, what is the optimum value of δ which minimizes the running time of an adiabatic algorithm? Although we do not intend to do a thorough study of this question in this letter, we would like to give some insight into this question and provide a qualitative discussion of what kind of results might be expected.

Extending [1, 4] about the condition imposed by the adiabatic theorem on algorithmic running time T ,

$$T \gg \frac{\epsilon}{g_{min}^2}, \quad (5)$$

one can show that the value of ϵ , aside from scaling polynomially in the number of variables, scales linearly in δ for both CAQC and SAQC. From our numerical results on typical minimum gap values (Fig. 3), there seem to be at least two distinguishable regimes for the dependence of g_{min} on δ for both CAQC and SAQC. For relatively small values of $\delta \in [0.5, 1.5]$, g_{min} scales approximately linearly with δ and therefore $g_{min}^2 \sim \delta^2$. Since running time is given by Eq. 5, and $\epsilon \sim \delta$, the running time T decays inversely proportional to δ within this linear regime. However, for large values of δ , in the ‘stationary’ regime where g_{min} is almost constant, increasing field intensity through δ would make both algorithms less efficient as running time T would increase roughly linearly with δ .

Both CAQC and SAQC would benefit from an increase in the transverse field for small values of δ , but notice that g_{min} values for SAQC are more sensitive to δ , and soon become better on average than those for CAQC (Fig. 3). According to the above discussion about running time

as a function of δ , it would be ideal to choose δ at the end of the linear regime (in our calculations, $\delta \in (1, 2)$) if one had to provide a value of δ for adiabatic evolution. Further studies concerning the optimum value of δ as a function of the number of binary variables are needed.

Data sorted with respect to BFs and UCs (Fig. 3) show a clear trend towards a larger value of g_{min} for guesses with a small number of bit flips from the solution, but the trend for UC is less apparent. The clear result is that there is a close connection between large values of g_{min} and a small number of BFs. Unfortunately there is no way to determine *a priori* how many bit flips the guess is from the solution, as that requires knowledge of the solution itself. On the other hand, computing the number of UCs produced by a given initial guess can be done in polynomial time on a classical computer.

In the following lines, we use the term significantly better initial guess to mean an initial condition that leads a SAQC algorithm to be at least twice as fast as CAQC, i.e. running times for CAQC, T_{CAQC} , and SAQC, T_{SAQC} , are such that $T_{CAQC} \geq 2T_{SAQC}$ or, equivalently, $g_{min}^{SAQC} \geq \sqrt{2} g_{min}^{CAQC}$, assuming $\epsilon_{CAQC} = \epsilon_{SAQC}$.

Fig. 4(a) shows that the SAQC implementation, using $\hat{H}_{driving}$ as defined in Eq. 4, does not necessarily favor states with low values of UC, but rather gives a homogeneously distributed success probability between 25-45%, for $\delta = 1.5$. This is in accordance to the observation that solving 3-SAT hard instances is not necessarily guided by minimizing the number of UCs [13].

Given the above scenario, we analyzed the likelihood of better performance by choosing initial guesses at random. Fig. 4(b) shows that, for $\delta = 1.5$, choosing an initial state at random yields a probability greater than 50% of having $g_{min}^{SAQC} \geq g_{min}^{CAQC}$ (squares). Moreover, the probability of significantly better performance, i.e. $T_{CAQC} \geq 2T_{SAQC}$ is $\approx 35\%$ for $\delta = 1.5$ (triangles). The third curve (circles) was produced under the following rationale: for USA in-

stances, the number of bit configurations for a given value of BF follows a binomial distribution $\binom{n}{BF}$. In the limit of large n , the likelihood of choosing a state in the central region of the binomial distribution is the highest. This observation led us to concentrate on the performance of the most populated instance subsets, those that correspond to $BF = 3, 4$ for 7 variables. Here, the probability of significantly better performance is close to 40%.




FIG. 4: (Color online) (a) $P(g_{min}^{SAQC} \geq \sqrt{2}g_{min}^{CAQC} | UC = n)$ is the conditional probability of choosing a state with $UC = n$ and an SAQC minimum-gap large enough to be at least twice as fast as CAQC, for $\delta = 1.5$. (b) shows the probability of choosing states at random and satisfying the condition specified in the legend.

We end this letter by proposing an algorithm based on SAQC (Fig. 5.) An initial guess is chosen either at random or by applying expert-domain knowledge and then encoded into the initial ground state of \hat{H}_i (Eq. 3). An adiabatic passage based on SAQC is then performed either in serial or in parallel, depending on the availability of quantum hardware resources. As an example of the potential usefulness of our algorithm, recall from Fig. 4 that the probability of significantly better performance using SAQC is 39% for $\delta = 1.5$.

Consequently, the execution of two SAQC algorithms in serial would take at most as much time as the execution of only one CAQC algorithm. By allowing us to choose two guesses to run in the same time as one case in CAQC, the probability of choosing a significantly better initial guess in these two SAQC executions increases from 39% to 63%. Furthermore, even when no significantly better initial guess is chosen and the process is not guaranteed to be fully adiabatic, there is still some




FIG. 5: (Color online) Implementation of an SAQC algorithm either in parallel or in serial.

probability that we measure the correct solution at the end of both executions.

In summary, our results show that there may be much to be gained by choosing an initial guess in SAQC, even when that guess is chosen at random. We also present the possibility of doing parallel adiabatic quantum computation with SAQC. In particular, our method opens up the possibility of using an educated guess based on physical intuition for structured problems. For example, in the case of our recent AQC algorithm proposed for protein folding [8], there is plenty of room for selecting reasonable configurations as well as excluding nonviable folding instances, such as the ones that spatially overlap amino acids. The results in this letter show that SAQC is a new strategy for quantum adiabatic algorithm development that offers the flexibility of using physical intuition and parallel implementation of quantum adiabatic algorithms to decrease computational time. SAQC is also suitable to study quantum problems [14, 15]. Further alternatives of $\hat{H}_{driving}$, as those found in [16], can also be explored in the context of SAQC. The connections between SAQC, quantum phase transitions [17], and the effect of local minima [18] remain to be explored.

All authors thank E. Farhi and S. Gutmann for useful discussions. SVA thanks P. Grasa and R. Rueda for their support, and Tecnológico de Monterrey Campus Estado de México for funding. AP and AAG gratefully acknowledge funding from D-Wave Systems and Harvard's Institute for Quantum Science and Engineering.

-
- [1] E. FARHI *et al.*, arXiv:quant-ph/0001106v1.
 - [2] A.M. CHILDS, E. FARHI, and J. PRESKILL, *Phys. Rev. A* **65**(1), 012322 (2001).
 - [3] D. LIDAR, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 160506 (2008).
 - [4] E. FARHI *et al.*, *Science* **292**, 472 (2001).
 - [5] T. HOGG, *Phys. Rev. A* **67**, 022314 (2003).
 - [6] M. ŽNIDARIČ, *Phys. Rev. A* **71**, 062305 (2005).
 - [7] A. P. YOUNG, S. KNYSH, and V. N. SMELYANSKIY, arXiv:quant-ph/0803.3971.
 - [8] A. PERDOMO *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. A*, *in press*.
 - [9] A. ASPURU-GUZZIK *et al.*, *Science* **309**, 1704 (2005).
 - [10] A. MESSIAH, *Quantum Mechanics*, Wiley (1976).
 - [11] D. ACHLIOPTAS, A. NAOR, and Y. PERES, *Nature* **435**, 759 (2005).
 - [12] M. MÉZARD, T. MORA, and R. ZECCHINA, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **94**, 197205 (2005).
 - [13] H. KAUTZ, and B. SELMAN, *Discrete Appl. Math.*, **155**(12), (2007).
 - [14] D. AHARONOV *et al.*, *SIAM J. Comput.*, **37**(1), (2007).
 - [15] A. MIZEL, D.A. LIDAR, and M. MITCHELL, *Phys. Rev. Lett* **99**, 070502 (2007).
 - [16] E. FARHI, J. GOLDSTONE, and S. GUTMANN, arXiv:quant-ph/0208135.
 - [17] R. SCHÜTZHOLD and G. SCHALLER, *Phys. Rev. A.* **74**, 060304 (2006).
 - [18] M. H. S. AMIN, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 130503 (2008).